THEOLOGY

VOL. LX AUGUST, 1957 No. 446

Editorial

IN 1954 the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, at the request of the Convocations, set up a Liturgical Commission for the Church of England. Its function is "to consider all matters of liturgical concern" that are referred to it by the Archbishops and to make reports. It has twenty-five members, all of whom are clergymen. We should have thought that there might have been some matters of liturgical concern which the Archbishops would have wanted lay members of the Church to consider and report upon.

The Commission has now issued its first Report, entitled *Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England: a Memorandum of the Church of England Liturgical Commission* (S.P.C.K., 4s. 6d.). It supplies in convenient form an account of what has so far happened about Prayer Book Revision in England and of how matters stand to-day. Since a generation or more has grown up that has no recollection of the events of 1927-8, it is certainly necessary to explain what transpired or expired then, before considering what should be done in future. The Commission is probably justified in suggesting that there are conditions in the Church of England now that are more favourable to an agreed advance to a revision of the Prayer Book than was the case twenty-five or fifty years ago. The Commission rightly urges that questions of discipline should be considered separately: "In all future work of Prayer Book revision *the sole purpose must be the provision of an enriched, worthier and more fitting vehicle for the worship of God in the Church of England.*"

The Report is not an adventurous document despite its repeated use of the *cliché* "We venture to . . ." We hope that sooner or later its labours may lead to the recommendation of forms of service, including a eucharistic liturgy, that could be authorized for experimental use for a prescribed period, and to even more venturesome proposals.[1]

There is section of the Report about "The Book of Common Prayer as a Bond of Unity and a Standard of Doctrine in the Anglican Communion", and the deliverances of past Lambeth Conferences on the subject are also printed. More interesting in this connexion is another Report that has been prepared by the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon, with the Lambeth Conference of 1958 in view. This is entitled *Principles of Prayer Book Re-*

[1] Incidentally, is it through ignorance or inadvertence that the Commission describes as "wrong-headed", without qualification, the historically orthodox expression "going into the Church" to signify the taking of Holy Orders? Cp. J. N. Figgis, *Churches in the Modern State*, pp. 186 ff.

vision (S.P.C.K., 7s. 6d.). It opens with an extended comparative study of existing revisions of the Book of Common Prayer in various provinces of the Anglican Communion, with special reference to the rites of Christian Initiation and Holy Communion, before going on to consider the liturgical problems that confront the C.I.P.B.C. itself, which were the subject of the "Letter from North India" that was published in THEOLOGY last year (October 1956).

* * * * *

For a graceful piece of holiday reading we recommend Dr Nathaniel Micklem's *The Box and the Puppets* (Geoffrey Bles, 13s. 6d.). He tells the story of his life with a captivating lightness of touch and charm of style. He refuses to allow that it is anything so solemn as an "autobiography". The book is full of good things, including some good stories and nicely phrased comments on his friends, e.g.: "Lord Lindsay was a very bad speaker in the restricted but important sense that he could not be heard; in other respects he was not unlike the Hebrew prophets."

* * * * *

The Prayers of Kierkegaard, edited with "a new interpretation of his life and thought" by Perry D. LeFevre (University of Chicago Press and C.U.P., 27s. 6d.), is less notable as a collection of prayers, though they are beautifully and spaciously printed, than for Professor LeFevre's essay of less than a hundred pages on Kierkegaard's life and message. It is this that may warrant Dr Walter Lowrie's comment that "it is the best book on Kierkegaard which has been written in English—or in any other language". Let us say rather it is as good a short introduction to Kierkegaard as exists.

* * * * *

Two more volumes have appeared in "The Library of Christian Classics" (S.C.M. Press, 35s. each). *A Scholastic Miscellany: Anselm to Ockham* is edited and translated by Dr E. R. Fairweather. A volume containing selections from the *Summa Theologica* of St Thomas Aquinas has already been published. In *A Scholastic Miscellany* many other medieval writers are represented, and the general reader who wishes to sample the literature of the period could hardly do better than to take this volume in hand. *Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers,* edited by Dr G. H. Williams and Dr A. M. Mergal, illustrates the teaching of the radical reformers of the sixteenth century or of what may be called "the left wing of the Reformation". Professor Mergal's contribution deals with "Evangelical Catholicism as represented by Juan de Valdés". Quite a lot has been done lately to improve our English knowledge of Luther and Calvin, but little is generally known among us about this further element in the Reformation movement. To many this may be one of the most enlightening volumes in the whole series.

* * * * *

With keen expectations we took up the selection from Bishop Hensley Henson's sermons, preached in the diocese of Durham, that has been published under the title, *Theology and Life* (Mowbray, 10s. 6d.) in the "Sermons of To-day Series". But alas! in our opinion, nothing could be further from the truth than the assertion of the blurb that "these sermons possess all the characteristics associated with their famous, much loved, and often controversial author". As proceeding from such a source, the sermons are unbelievably commonplace. Only just occasionally there is a passage that is reminiscent of the authentic Henson, as when, speaking of books and pamphlets about the Second Advent that were sent to him, he says: "The writers impress me by their ignorance; amaze me by their ingenuity; and revolt me by their confidence."

* * * * *

In *Message for a Mission* (Mowbray, 2s. 6d.), the booklet containing his proposal for a national mission, the Archdeacon of London says that the determining question ought to be: "Would it not greatly impress the country and predispose multitudes of people to listen if the Church were to avow its intention of conducting its own nation-wide teaching mission?" We trust we are not unduly sceptical, but it surprises us that anyone with the Archdeacon's experience should answer that question in the affirmative. Nor can we agree with his general assumption that "the value of missions, crusades and other evangelistic projects is obvious". We should wish for a good deal of discrimination to be made between different kinds of "mission". In particular, before subscribing to the desirability of a national mission, we should like to see a comparative study made of the 1949 Mission to London, which the Archdeacon deems to have set a pattern, and of the Mission de Paris and the Mission de France which, we suspect, may be based on a deeper analysis and a more far-sighted strategy. Nevertheless whatever may be thought of the Archdeacon's plea for a national mission, he is no doubt right in maintaining that there ought to be more system in the way the Church's message is regularly preached and presented.

Divorce and Christian Teaching

THERE are three main views on marriage and divorce current in the Church of England to-day, but none of them is ultimately satisfactory. The first is the Rigorist view, which is the same as that held in the Church of Rome. The second I will call the Pastoral view: it is set out in a pamphlet by the Rev. J. Howard Cruse and Canon Bryan Green called *Marriage, Divorce and Repentance in the Church of England.* The third is really a variant of the first, and might be called the "Two Standards" view.

The last of these seems to be the least influential and can be dis-

cussed briefly. Those who hold it say that the Church can lay down rules for its own members but ought not to try to force them on those outside, and that therefore there ought to be two explicit kinds of marriage: secular, which can be dissolved by a legal process; and Christian, which is declared from the outset to be indissoluble. This is open to attack on the grounds of both theory and practice. The Bishop of Exeter, who holds the Rigorist view, insists that since the priest and the registrar are "only witnesses", "a marriage in a registry office is just as much a marriage . . . as a marriage in church";[1] and that indissolubility "is right and God's will for every marriage, not just Christian marriages".[2] From the Pastoral point of view it can be urged that if there were officially two standards of marriage people on the fringes of the Church would be driven out, and a fine opportunity for evangelizing would be lost.

We are therefore left with the other two views. Rigorists maintain that divorce is in fact impossible and that those who remarry afterwards are actually living in sin, so that however hard the case nothing can be done for them unless they will give it up. The Pastoral view is that divorce is not impossible but wrong, and that a second marriage, if based on penitence for the failure of the first, can be built up into a true Christian marriage. Just as the murderer has really killed his victim, and cannot bring him back even by repentance, so the divorced person has really killed his marriage, and is not committing a new sin by marrying again.

The Pastoral view has much to commend it to those who emphasize the Church's duty "to seek and to save that which was lost". Mr Cruse and Canon Green stress that, far from weakening the Church's witness, pastoral care for the divorced on the lines they propose can even be a positive witness to Christian teaching on marriage. "Experience," they point out,[3] "seems to suggest very often that the [Rigorist] attitude . . . so far from enhancing the value of the Church's witness, weakens it in the eyes of the world. It is not the case that those outside are 'offended' by the Church's strong stand, knowing in their hearts that the Church is right, but rather that they think the Church to be unchristian and unhelpful."

This is at least partly true; but the dangers of a weakening of principle remain. Some divorced people certainly feel at present, not that they must try to discover the Will of God for them, but that they must try to discover a clergyman whose views about divorce are not too strict. Conversely, it is surely true that, where divorce is difficult or impossible, people take marriage more seriously and are more likely to be successful.

But even if one could avoid these objections to the Pastoral view there remain two great difficulties for it. The first is that it is not comprehensive enough. Canon Green admits[4] that on this view there are "a certain number of cases where it is impossible to go forward", and where he can only offer "a sympathetic understanding". He

[1] R. C. Mortimer, *Christian Ethics*, p. 112.
[2] R. C. Mortimer, *The Duties of a Churchman*, p. 10.
[3] P. 48. [4] P. 49.

mentions particularly "those difficult moral cases" where the marriage of A and C is in question, and it turns out "that the previous marriage of A and B was broken up entirely through A's meeting with and love for C". But a very large number of marriages which finally break up do so because one partner wants to marry someone else: these are not a handful of special cases, and one cannot be sure that they are invariably the least deserving ones. If the Pastoral view has to exclude these it has failed on its own ground.

Secondly, and still more serious, one cannot in conscience deny that the Pastoral view has to give a forced interpretation of the recorded teaching of Christ. It might indeed be said that it goes completely against it. The plausibility of the theory depends on the idea that in some cases divorce and remarriage are completely separate and that the sinfulness is attached to the divorce and not to the remarriage. But the Gospels suggest nothing of the kind. On the contrary, "Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her."[1] Matthew's Gospel adds, "and whosoever shall marry her when she is put away committeth adultery".[2] Attempts to explain this away[3] can only sound like specious casuistry to a Rigorist, however much he may respect the motive of Christian charity which actuates them. The teaching was felt to be hard at the time:[4] we have no right to try to wriggle round it.

The Rigorist view, on the other hand, has the great advantage of endeavouring to hold fast the plain meaning of Christ's recorded words. Those who hold it are willing to accept unpalatable logical consequences. They will not compromise Christian principles by allowing people to eat their cake and have it, or weaken their witness to the sanctity of Christian marriage by making exceptions for hard cases. There is always forgiveness, they would say, for the worst of sinners, but to be forgiven people must repent, and one cannot, as Shakespeare's Claudius sees, "be pardoned and retain the offence". Some of the cases are very hard, but all the Church can do is to try to help people to repent: it cannot say that they may go on living in sin without repentance.

This is a point of view which one must respect. The trouble is that the hardness of some of the cases is of a peculiar kind. Claudius found repentance too difficult for him: "Yet what can it when one can not repent?" Many divorced people are faced by an even worse question, "What can it" when one *may* not repent, when to repent in the sense required of them would only make matters worse. Perhaps their first marriage is broken beyond repair, whereas by marrying again, however wrongly, they have taken on real responsibilities to other people, especially if they have had children. It is neither practical nor Christian to say that they ought to abandon

[1] Mark 10. 2–12.

[2] Matt. 5. 32. See also Matt. 19. 9 and Luke 16. 18. I am assuming that Matthew's qualification "except for fornication" is not original; but however it is to be interpreted it lends no support to the Pastoral view.

[3] E.g. Cruse and Green, p. 22.

[4] Matt. 19. 10.

these responsibilities, nor to say that they must pay the price by being permanently cut off from the Church. There is something wrong with a doctrine which leaves no way of repentance open to people who want to do their duty.

But what makes the Rigorist view really difficult to maintain is that the decision in some of the hard cases seems to depend not on any moral situation but on luck. Often it seems to be two blacks making a white: two wrong states of affairs cancel each other out and add up to legal rightness. Mr Cruse quotes the case[1] of "a divorcee, who was converted to the Christian faith afterwards", and "was given permission by a Bishop to be married again in Church, on the grounds of Pauline privilege. This was given because as a baby he had not been baptized. If he had, the permission would not have been given." Or one might put the case of a man who has married a divorced woman. Rigorists would say he is really living in sin, committing adultery with a married woman. If this "marriage" breaks up they must surely allow that the man is free to marry again, since he has never been really married, however solemnly he made vows to his first "wife" and however long they were happy together. Or again, many people approve the Catholic practice of giving relief in particular hard cases by granting annulments wherever possible while maintaining the prohibition of divorce; but this must lead to arbitrary results. For example, it is said that "a resolve before marriage never to have children" will "vitiate a marriage".[2] But this means in effect that a woman whose husband loves her but has always refused to have children can leave him and marry someone else, whereas if her husband is cruel to her or leaves her for another woman she is not free. This cannot be the way moral problems were meant to be decided, and if the Rigorist view leads one to this kind of difficulty it is time to look at the Gospels again to see if this is a true interpretation of Christ's words.

But when one looks again one does not find that it is too strict an interpretation, but that it is not strict enough. Even separation of a husband and wife does not appear to be allowed. "And there came to him Pharisees, and asked him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife? tempting him. And he answered and said unto them, What did Moses command you? And they said, Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put her away. But Jesus said unto them, For your hardness of heart he wrote you this commandment. But from the beginning of the creation, Male and female made he them. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the twain shall become one flesh; so that they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."[3] The strictest Rigorist does not think that because of this the Church should insist on married people remaining together even if they are actually fighting each other. It seems therefore that neither the Rigorist nor the Pastoral view as it

[1] P. 34.
[2] Mortimer, *Christian Ethics*, p. 115.
[3] Mark 10. 2–9.

stands is fully in accordance with the New Testament: there must be some other answer.

To me it appears most significant that one of the contexts in which Christ's teaching on divorce appears in the Gospels is the "Sermon on the Mount", where it is placed[1] in a series of new commandments in which people are told to act in a different spirit from the old law. There is no suggestion that the commandment on divorce is on a different footing from the commandment on lust: "Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt not commit adultery: but I say unto you, that every one that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart". Only two verses separate this from the parallel commandment: "It was said also, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: but I say unto you, that every one that putteth away his wife, [saving for the cause of fornication[2]], maketh her an adulteress: and whosoever shall marry her when she is put away committeth adultery."[3] Moreover, a little further on we find, "Ye have heard that it was said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, Resist not him that is evil: but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man would go to law with thee, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloke also."[4] Whatever interpretation we give to Christ's teaching on divorce must therefore also be capable of covering his teaching on lust, fighting and going to law. This may help us, most certainly not to water down his principles, but to see their real significance.

The Pastoral view, indeed, will take us quite a long way in this direction. What I should like to do is carry what it says on this subject rather further. Mr Cruse urges strongly[5] that "our Lord did not legislate or provide a new moral code of detailed precepts or rules which must be invariably followed. Rather he flung down uncompromising principles of right conduct, absolute and unqualified in their demands, and left it to his followers to work out the application in the relativities of their daily lives." This is true and most important; but I think it needs to be taken further. If we put too much weight on the suggestion that Christ's principles need not be "invariably followed" in every particular case we shall have merely watered down his teaching without really escaping from legalism.

I should like to maintain that the root of the problem is a misconception of the nature of law in its relation to Christian morality. We have law, as Christ expressly told us, for our hardness of heart. It is what can be required of us. That is, it has two main characteristics: it is just and it is external. Many bodies make laws; the lawmaker par excellence is the State, but it is not the only one. Apart from smaller organizations within the State, such as schools and clubs, making laws for their own members, there is public opinion, whose laws we feel to be just as binding in their own way as the law

[1] Matt. 5. 21–end.
[2] See note above, p. 313.
[3] Matt. 5. 28–32.
[4] Ibid. 38–40.
[5] P. 27.

of the land. Public opinion legislates about such things as not being mean, not being "immoral", keeping one's temper, and keeping one's place in a queue. Some of its laws are often more highly regarded than some of the laws of the land, such as those about customs duty or parking. But what all these laws have in common is that they set standards of decent behaviour which people feel that they may reasonably require of one another, and create a system of rights and duties, the whole point of which is to be fair.

Now Christianity is not "fair". Christ's demands exceed legality, and ask more of us than can "reasonably" be expected. Law requires, for example, that a man takes only what is his due, that he limits revenge to the claiming of suitable damages, that he only fights in self-defence and that he does not arbitrarily abandon his innocent wife. The Christian teaching is rather that a man does not insist even on his rights, that he loves his enemies, that he turns the other cheek, and that he remains faithful to his wife for better or worse. From a Christian point of view, he who hates his brother is a murderer; and likewise he who puts away his wife is an adulterer. If we are meant to keep these requirements as laws our case is hopeless. If St Paul could not attain to righteousness under the law of Moses, how can we hope to do so under a stricter law still? And if we are meant to enforce these requirements as laws on other people we shall inevitably find ourselves either being uncharitable or compromising our principles.

It is no solution to say that Christ was only setting ideals before us rather than laying down inflexible laws. The ideals are meant to become actual: we are to be "perfect". The point is that this can be achieved only by transcending law altogether. Christian morals are a Way, not a code: the Christian spirit consists not in keeping the rules better than other people nor in keeping stricter rules, but in not needing rules at all. This is not to deny that rules are useful to begin with or that law can be "our tutor to bring us unto Christ", as St Paul described the Mosaic law;[1] but as soon as one tries to surpass the standards of ordinary decent behaviour there is no substitute for the Christian spirit itself. If people achieve the spirit of Christian love questions of their rights do not arise, and it becomes possible and indeed natural for them to keep the New Testament commandments; but if our hearts are still hard it is useless to try to by-pass this spirit, as it were, and set up Christian principles as laws for people to obey.

When one begins to ask legal questions about moral problems one has already stepped outside Christianity. A mother does not ask, "How little need I spend on presents for my children?" or "How much may I punish them for being naughty?" She may find it difficult to decide how much she *ought* to spend or punish, but this is not a problem of law, and as soon as it becomes one of law she is to that extent not behaving like a mother. In the same way a Christian as a Christian does not ask, "How little need I give to the poor?" or

[1] Gal. 3. 24.

"How much retribution may I exact from my enemies?" Nor can he ask, "In what circumstances may I divorce my wife?" There is no *Christian* answer to these questions and the Church ought not to try to supply one.

If someone comes and asks, "May I as a Christian remarry after divorce?" he is like a man who asks, "May I as a Christian claim damages in a law court for a wrong done to me?" or "May I as a Christian kill someone in self-defence?" The answer is: You have the right. What you gain by it cannot be denied to you. But you cannot say you are doing it "as a Christian". To some extent, possibly very slight but possibly very great, you are betraying Christian principles by acting in a spirit of hatred or of adultery. Perhaps in this particular case it is genuinely the least of evils. God knows when we are honestly acting for the best and when we are hypocritically persuading ourselves that it will be all right. It is by the spirit in which we act that we shall be judged: what is required of us is not simply to keep a law but to try to see what in our own circumstances is the course most in accordance with the spirit of Christian love.

The chief advantage of this view is that people may start at any time to act in a Christian spirit. They are not beyond help, even if as a result of their past behaviour they are involved in a situation which as Christians they ought never to have been in, but from which they cannot now disentangle themselves without doing worse harm. Their actions have been unchristian, but valid. The man who has remarried has insisted on his legal rights. This was a betrayal of the Christian spirit, and from the Christian point of view he has committed adultery, but this does not mean that he is necessarily in a quasi-legal state of "living in sin". If legality is what we want, the law allows divorce in certain circumstances and protects the rights of the individual. The Church's job is not to tighten this law up, any more than it is to tighten up the law of murder to cover those who hate, but to show people that the whole idea of mere "legality" is inadequate for the Christian. It should not pronounce favourably or unfavourably upon a man's rights, but say, "Never mind your rights. Here is a better way altogether."

On this view the question of whether or not a man is living sinfully is a moral question, not a legal one, and depends upon the spirit in which he is living now, not upon the spirit in which he has acted in the past, still less upon events beyond his control such as whether or not he was baptized as a baby. This does not mean that all difficulties are abolished, but that they appear in the right place, where one would expect them. Instead of looking for loopholes in a law people are to ask what from now on they really ought to do. Presumably moral decisions will always be hard. A theory which made moral problems sound easy would be as suspect as one which made them insoluble. It should indeed be emphasized that sometimes acting in a Christian way will demand real heroism. People may find that they must be loyal to a marriage in which they are miserable with no real hope of better times, or that they must give up the society of another person with whom they are deeply in love. But

they will be doing these things from a positive spirit of love, not because no way can be found of avoiding the application of a law. Christianity ought to be heroic; but it ought not to be unreasonable. It *is* unreasonable if people are obliged to cut themselves off permanently from the Church for the sake of others to whom they have wrongly but really taken on responsibilities; or to condemn others who to all appearance are more sinned against than sinning; or on the other hand to try to twist Christ's recorded words to try to make them sound more lenient. On the present view one may recognize the validity of the ordinary law of decent behaviour and yet understand how it ought to be transcended.

The practical application of this theory should not be too difficult. There are two main questions: the admission of divorced people to Holy Communion, and the blessing of their marriages in church. The Church of England seems to be increasingly coming to the conclusion that it is wrong and unchristian to refuse Communion as a penal measure. Many people feel most strongly that in any case admission to Communion ought never to be considered to imply approval of the past, but hope for the future, and that this ought to be perfectly clear to everyone who comes: to make divorce a more serious bar to receiving Communion than, for example, sharp business dealings or uncharitableness is to run a grave risk of putting one's emphasis in moral teaching quite differently from where Christ placed it. Yet there are many who are still worried about applying this to divorced people who have remarried, for they believe that such people are ex officio *unrepentant* sinners. If the view which I am putting forward is correct, one need not after all put the problem of divorce in a different category from other moral problems. People often step outside the sphere of Christian love and claim their rights, and very often in doing this they betray the spirit of Christianity; but to be a sinner is not necessarily to be an "open and notorious evil-liver".

The question of remarriage in church or "services of blessing" is rather different. People should surely not expect to receive the formal blessing of the Church when they act in a spirit of law rather than of love. It is true that it may be argued on behalf of "services of blessing" that it is a deep-seated human instinct to ask for God's blessing; that whenever possible this should be encouraged; that the Church is certainly right to try to bless people even when it cannot necessarily bless their actions; and that this should be carried very far for the sake of the pastoral good it does. The analogy of church parades might be urged; the cynical or the severe might say that they were a form of blessing violence, yet they also seem to be a way of helping to keep violence under control.

But in spite of this the arguments on the other side cannot be denied. These point out that it is a deep-seated human instinct to try to eat one's cake and have it, and that the Church is only weakening its witness if it gives any kind of solemn blessing to what Christ explicitly called adultery. The Church is not there to tell us to do just what we please, but to preach the Gospel.

The main point for which I am contending is that the problem of divorce is not fundamentally different from other moral problems. In trying to solve it two aspects of Christ's teaching ought especially to be borne in mind: that we must live in a spirit of love and not of law, and that anyone, however depraved so far, may still start to live in this spirit. If the Church can do full justice to both of these the New Testament teaching on any particular moral question ought to fall into place, and it should become possible for it to cease to worry over legal questions about the status of divorced people and concentrate on its positive doctrine of what kind of person a Christian ought to be.

L. H. Oppenheimer.

Priest or Bishop

Yesterday the clergy met in conference to discuss youth work. Many excellent ideas were expressed and great value was found in the exchange. To-day, however, they are back in the maelstrom of parish life, caught up in matters demanding urgent attention, with not the remotest chance of putting into effect more than a few of the practices determined upon yesterday. Nor will the opportunity to-morrow or the day after be more favourable. The clergyman is a bottleneck without a bottle underneath into which the liquid of good ideas can be allowed to pass.

Size and Scale.—Consider any other organization. Take the army. Few parishes are smaller than a battalion of 1,000 men. A brigade (5,000) would be nearer the measure for most, and a division (15,000) for many. From time to time the commanding officer is called to headquarters. When all is decided he returns to his unit and calls his officers in conference. A colonel has at least 50 commissioned officers, a brigade commander 150, and a divisional commander 500. In a short time every officer, N.C.O. and man knows what he must do, and is supervised in the doing of it. The army can be on the move in almost no time.

Now look at the parish. The vicar returns with his plans. If it is about youth work he is relatively favourably placed. He has enough assistants to deal with that fraction (large or small) of the total children who are in his Sunday school, and he can do something with the small percentage of teenagers who are in his youth club. He can touch some, but the greater part of the older children at least will never hear the plan, let alone begin to execute it. And youth work is a particularly favourable example.

But take anything else. Suppose it had been a conference on visiting. The equivalent army commander could have 50 or 500 officers

holding the Queen's commission at work in a matter of hours. But the vicar has as his lieutenants one or two assistant curates, or, more probably, none at all. He attempts to do alone what needs 50 or 500 men. An army commander who tried to conduct a campaign on his own would be rightly censured and relieved of his command. But this is precisely what the parochial clergy are attempting to do. It is only surprising that they do not do a great deal worse.

Every parish clergyman is vaguely aware of the size of the problem and most are making piecemeal efforts to get more people to help. But their efforts are doomed because their appointed representatives neither feel themselves to hold the Church's commission nor are they accepted as sufficient by others.

One Community or Many?—The solution must come at the confluence of practice and theology. The Bishop of Jarrow has recently been reported as saying that a vicar of a modern parish is like a bishop of old: his ministry is not only priestly in nature but episcopal also. If this is correct it may provide the theological foundation on which we can build our parochial "dioceses". For the vicar to attempt to do what his predecessor in small rural parishes has done so well is to deny his creatureliness. Thus our parish practice to-day is based on something very close to the root sin of pride.

The diocesan parallel suggests that the incumbent as overseer (episcopus, bishop) is assisted by a large number of elders (presbuteroi, priests), and that a third order of servants (deacons, ministers) is also found. These might be chosen from the faithful and authorized to perform the relevant functions in the cure of souls.

But here we must be careful. We must not base everything on a doctrine of the Church which severs it from that of creation. If F. D. Maurice is right and "the Church is the world restored to its relationship to God", then the existing ordering of society and its existing officers must not be overlooked.

The Community of Family.—The obvious first place where authority resides in the order of creation is the family. Its head is the father, or the father and mother together in their one-flesh union. Oddly enough, this gives the Church its N.C.O.s in almost equal proportion to a fighting service, where there is one N.C.O. for every four men. Operation Firm Faith is making this emphasis on the practical level, but lacks driving force because its roots in God's purposes are not sufficiently understood. Let us put it plainly. Every father and mother are responsible to God for the family he has given them, as they are responsible for the conduct of their marriage. They are God's delegates for the task and, therefore, *in some sense*, officers of the Church also.

It is this latter point which is seldom perceived or admitted, let alone pondered and thought out. Yet the very name "priest" (presbyter, elder) is derived from the natural family and transferred to the Family of God. The home has a sufficiency of its own, a priesthood of its own, with its own quasi-sacramental life at the family board, and its own Ministry of the Word. This sufficiency must be recognized and used, though it is not *complete* sufficiency. The

family is pressed to come to the parish church as a family precisely because to come separately is to deny before God the unity which he himself has given them. Recognition of this "priesthood" in the family gives the parish priest/bishop a very large number of assistant curates—1,000 or more in a parish of 5,000.

The Community of Work.—Similarly where men work they find themselves in a community with its own officers, rules and structure. This, morals apart, is of God (in the Pauline sense). The man of God will see these communities of work as part of God's creation, and, therefore, as part of his kingdom. His chief longing will be that men may come to recognize it, and bring it to the worship of Almighty God. A factory or pit which called itself a church factory or pit would be an anachronism and unnecessary. Not for us the division of such things as railway carriages into Christian and non-Christian, as they are divided into Moslem and Hindu in other lands. In a Christian country every factory, ship or school should be a church factory ship or school because Church should mean the same as Christian. It is not the denominational differences of Christians alone which prevent such thoughts from being expressed, but defective doctrines of Work and of Creation.

Lord of All Life.—All this is really part of the Epiphany message. Not only all men but every department of human life is under the sovereignty of God. Thus the parish priest in prophetic mood (or any inspired member of his flock) speaks with as much authority in the pit as in the pulpit. For a moment he sees the world, organized within his own parish into a thousand intersecting communities, as ordained of God, and parched and barren only because it does not worship him. But, alas! the prophetic mood passes and the priest finds himself again in the fallen world where he must return to narrow church routine or see his work perish.

Here, then, is our problem at the theological level. The doctrine of Creation alone leads to one conclusion, which we might designate as Universalist. The doctrine of Sin and Redemption leads to a Particularist conclusion. The Liberals and Modernists will tend to take the first in isolation; the legalist will draw his force from the latter. But the truth is in both poles of thought *together*; and the problem is in resisting a simple answer which takes one alone. For, whether the simile of poles is based on magnetism or on geography, one pole by itself is useless.

The Solution in Practice.—Let me give my solution as it might apply to a large hospital. There are 800 beds: 500 people wish—or ought to wish—to make their communion. It is impossible for the chaplain to do more than a few, as well as theologically inadmissible, for he simply is *not* their day-to-day pastor. This is rather the ward sister and the doctor(s) normally associated with the ward. The solution is clear. The Holy Communion is celebrated in the chapel. Representatives from each ward (in appropriate orders) take the Reserved Sacrament to the patients. Nor need the Sacraments be divorced from the Ministry of the Word, for in many hospitals evening services are taken nightly by the regular staff. The chaplain thus

has as many assistants in his cure as there are ward sisters (and doctors).

The solution in a parish is less easy to envisage. The communities are far more complex and overlapping. The danger of indiscipline and disloyalty are greater. Perhaps some sort of oath of allegiance to the parish priest/bishop would be necessary and would follow from the diocesan analogy. The needs, however, are clear: many more men authorized to do all or some of the duties of a presbyter. Services for work—and community—groups in great number would have to be arranged and conducted. A church which holds only hundreds would have to open its doors to thousands during the course of a week. Worship on Sundays might have to be rationed (wonderful thought!). Sub-centres of worship would have to be allowed and encouraged in schools and places of work, perhaps even at every street corner; and all the dangers inherent in expansion would have to be guarded against. For expand we must, for the modern parish is no longer one commuunity but dozens, and if it is to be brought to the worship of God, and his Word and Sacraments ministered, this must be done not by one but by dozens of authorized ministers. The ministry of the existing priest will be seen to be essentially episcopal in nature. His will be the task of oversight. A striking change will come over the parson (persona). No longer will his harassed figure be seen racing here, there and everywhere (like the soldiers in the fort in *Beau Geste* firing dead men's rifles); instead he will become the serene father of his people, the wise consultant to whom they can come to talk over their problems, to sharpen their vision to see the world with the eyes of Christ.

The time-honoured precept that the parish priest must visit will now apply to his delegates, for it is too important to be half or quarter done. The pastoral skills of dealing with saint or sinner, with birth or death, with sick or whole, will be exercised on a scale never before seen in urban society. New pastors will arise and be taught by the priest/bishop. It is possible even to envisage managers and trade union leaders (some of them in holy orders) coming to consult with their Father in God about the day-to-day running of their affairs.

The Ability to Expand.—Let us finish with another military analogy. A small regular army which is unable to multiply itself ten or twentyfold in six months or a year fails in its first essential. So likewise a parish system geared to populations of hundreds stands condemned if it cannot expand to deal with thousands. It is the writer's belief that the parish system will live because it will be found able to make the increase. But time is short and the first new cadres must now be formed.

M. R. Talbot.

Natural Joy and the Christian

Joy is of the essence of Christian revelation. The Epistles resound with it. Joy links Love with Peace as pre-eminently "the fruit of the Spirit". "Lift up your hearts", we are bidden at every Eucharist, and we acknowledge that "it is meet and right so to do".

"Rejoice in the Lord alway." *In the Lord*—yes, assuredly; our faith would be meaningless if we did not. But in what else is the Christian permitted, if not actually enjoined, to rejoice, and in what spirit should he do so? This, it has always seemed to me, is a matter on which Christian teaching has been extremely ill-defined, where it has not been absent altogether. Those who come from other traditions have indeed found it natural to repudiate the joylessness of Puritanism, and certainly the suspicion of all pleasure on principle is a curious doctrine for anyone who believes, as surely any Christian must, that as Maurice was always proclaiming, "the world belongs to God and not to the Devil". As an undergraduate poet of my generation stated the matter:

> The Puritan through God's sweet garden goes
> To pluck the thorn and cast away the rose,
> And thinks to please, by this peculiar whim,
> The God who fashioned it and gave it him.

Peculiar indeed.

Yet what is fundamentally in question here is no merely "protestant" aberration. Is there, we may ask, any sufficient philosophy of natural joy evident in Catholic teaching? Certainly the sublime rhythm of the liturgical year, in which feast contrasts with fast, does much to emphasize the spiritual balance of the Christian faith. And the secular revelry which has assimilated "holy day" to holiday, and now represents all that is left for most people of such a season as Christmas, was a wholly natural and justifiable upshot of the sacred truths recalled by "Red Letter Days". But what is involved in this context is the celebration of fixed occasions, not any spontaneous ebullience or unbidden joy. The real issue, as I see it, does not lie here, but concerns rather the validity of what will at any rate appear to be a purely sub-lunar happiness, the enjoyment of things transient and mundane, however elevated the sentiments to which the experience they provide may sometimes give rise. In what spirit are we to accept, embrace, even perhaps invite if we may such experience? On what grounds can the Christian claim the right to do so?

To some, no doubt, the question will seem unreal. Happiness, when it is not merely irresponsible, is seen as a psychological or even a physical accident—the upshot of a "sunny nature", a sanguine disposition, or merely a good digestion, as of course it often is; it has no deeper origin and no further significance, certainly not a religious one. That is why religion has nothing to say about it. I have never myself felt satisfied with this suggestion. It does not go deep enough. Natural joy, when we are visited by it, is one of the most self-authenticating of human experiences, even on its more superficial

levels. It cannot be left unrelated to a faith which is surely something less than what it claims to be if it is not integrated as fully with joy as it is with suffering.

There are two reasons, I think, why such an integration has never been satisfactorily achieved. The first is historical. The Church was born in expectation of two things—one temporal, persecution; the other spiritual, the *parousia*. This being so, it followed that not merely in an ultimate but in a proximate sense, "we have here no continuing city". The first Christians recalled that their Master had told them that in this world they would have tribulation, but they were to be of good cheer for he had overcome the world. And his return to vindicate this victory was to be expected at no distant date. In such circumstances joy in the things of earth was not a matter upon which Christians were likely to ponder for long, and our scripture is not concerned with it. This being so, it is understandable that it should have remained neglected by Christian thought.

But the second reason is yet more fundamental. The Christian understanding of man's nature and history as essentially tragic, if viewed apart from his redemption by a Power beyond himself, leads easily to a view of the world as inescapably, and quite naturally, a "vale of tears". Expelled from Eden, the situation of fallen man is inseparable from suffering. Many a Christian child has been taught to think like this from his cradle. Instructed by a pious nurse, I myself, somewhat to my mother's dismay, was heard to warble in my cot of

> The twials that beset you,
> The twoubles ye endure,
> The manifold temptations
> That death alone can cure.

No doubt I did so cheerfully enough, since I was by temperament a cheerful child in a happy home. But such rather one-sided interpretations of the human pilgrimage tend to leave their mark upon the juvenile imagination, with the result that as the young Christian grows up, earthly joys do not easily fit into his understanding of the faith. Happiness remains external to it; it is not only upon the budding philosopher, but upon the Christian adolescent also, that "cheerfulness keeps breaking in". Joy presents itself as an invader of the Christian religion, something which does not belong there.

As the Christian grows older and begins to live at a deeper level, he finds suffering accepted there not merely as something inescapable, nor even for its disciplinary value, but as at least potentially a means of uniting us to our Redeemer—"filling up in ourselves the sufferings of Christ". And this, of course, not only or mainly on the physical plane, but more profoundly on the intellectual and spiritual ones. It is precisely the most spiritually "advanced" who must chiefly expect, and learn how to accept and use, the Dark Night of the Soul.

Can we doubt that all this arouses perplexity in the "average" Christian, if he is in normal health and not too harassing circumstances, more especially if he is in the full vitality of youth? In the

trials, troubles and temptations so truly foreshadowed in the hymn, he may expect, or at any rate hope, to find "the consolations of religion". But when he feels himself most alive, most exhilarated, most in tune with beauty and delight, he may be visited by an uneasy suspicion that he is somehow less truly a Christian for being so. A sort of schizophrenia may then threaten him, conscious in so far as he reflects upon the matter, but far more often no doubt sub-conscious, yet in either case spiritually paralysing as all such moods must be.

Let us take a concrete instance on a very simple level. A young person returns from a dance where he (or she) has had his whole being caught up in the joy of a rhythmic experience and the delight of a companionship happily, perhaps intimately, shared. His head is full of the music, recapturing melodies which he will take into his dreams. But before this he has his night prayers to say. How is he to relate them to the mood, the excited yet very "mundane" mood, which he is in? Is he to feel that a thanksgiving for this mood can be wholly fitting to the underlying profundities of his belief; is he to suspect that this would mean some degradation of them to what he recognizes as the transient pleasures under the influence of which he still is? Or is he to fall back on some hallowed formulas which in fact bear no relation to his present state of mind?

Cannot our wisest Christian teachers give us—and especially the younger among us—more guidance in all this than has been normally forthcoming from them? What follows here is a mere groping towards an answer to some of the questions already raised; the author would be grateful to know how far it may be held to be on the right lines.

Since spiritual joy is clearly of the essence of our faith, what seems above all necessary is an effort towards the clarification and extension of our understanding of this to bring it into an authentic relation to the joy we experience upon the natural plane.

To begin with a question. Is there not perhaps sometimes, with many of us, a quite unworthy apprehension of what the spiritual joy of the Christian really is? Other-worldliness is degraded into next-worldliness. There comes upon us at moments a form of self-congratulation that our religion provides us with resources denied to those without it—a sort of "supernatural" snobbery. Related to this is a view of the "consolations of religion" which provides us with an alibi for not troubling ourselves over the sins and predicaments of society, which we can afford to disregard since they are but a passing phase of a wicked world of which we shall soon be safely rid. No instructed Christian who is honest with himself can really accept such attitudes as congruous with a valid understanding of his faith, but moods of this sort do invade many of us at times and are only too apt to dress themselves up in a "spiritual" guise. Our joy in the knowledge of a victory over sin and death, won for us by our Lord, becomes a pretext not for "filling up" his sufferings, but for escaping from them.

Surely the chief clue to our problem is to be found in the Incarna-

tion of Christ. "God so loved *the world*"—not men and women as individuals only, but his whole creative achievement, in which he has permitted them to co-operate at the risk of so terribly impairing it. The life of Christ here, the life of the very creating and redeeming Agent himself, while it showed acceptance of spiritual discipline to the full, was not the life of an ascetic. Jesus "came eating and drinking"; his first miracle was wrought at a party; he appeared at "feasts", and his parables and admonitions are often related in regard to them. This "normal" life did not unfit him to face the worst that the world could do to any man. But the Easter triumph did not see his immediate separation from the world he had rescued. Some, indeed, have thought of the "great forty days" as authenticating human society and the whole created order.

If this is so, surely what we need is a much more wide and understanding mood of thanksgiving for "our creation, preservation and all the blessings of this life". This understanding must not, as assuredly it need not, blind us to the greater debt we owe to God for those things for which we are "chiefly bound to praise him". It is the Christian's assurance that his faith rescues him, by reliance on a power beyond himself, from the despair of meaninglessness and the frustration of helplessness, which gives him the warrant to feel that all innocent joy is a part of our authentic existence as the children of God, and not an unaccountable visitation from out of a mysterious cloud of darkness encompassing an unintelligible world. To know this will not save him from suffering, but it will put this in its proper place. Chesterton expressed the truth about this half a century ago, when he said at the end of *Orthodoxy*, "Man is more himself, man is more manlike, when joy is the fundamental thing in him, and grief the superficial. Melancholy should be an innocent interlude, a tender and fugitive frame of mind; praise should be the permanent pulsation of the soul."

Certainly our religion has not been given to us to make us self-consciously and artificially "hearty". The "back-slapping brotherliness" which has often characterized a well-meaning but spurious "religiousness" repels by its lack of spontaneity. Nor is the "duty of cheerfulness" preached by some earnest persons any more authentic. Both are spurious because engendered by an effort to make our religion instrumental, to use it rather than to live it. "How to make friends and influence people" may (or may not) be granted to us by Grace; it cannot be studied and applied as a Christian technique.

Two things may be recalled in conclusion. For the canonization of a saint it has always been held necessary that his character shall conspicuously manifest the quality of joy. And of the Christian figure who in this country and in this century has come nearest to being recognized by the English people as a true representative of their traditional faith, William Temple, it is related by his biographer that a simple countryman, who had known him, hearing of his death, said meditatively, "He was a jolly man."

MAURICE B. RECKITT.

Offertory and Oblation

Dr E. L. Mascall wrote in *Corpus Christi*:

> It is in any case most unfortunate that, when in 1661 the offertory was explicitly restored to the Anglican rite, it was placed before the prayer for the Church and not after the communion devotions.[1]

This important and constructive suggestion was not immediately explained, and as it stands may well be open to question. It may be objected that what was "explicitly restored" in 1661 is not the same as the rites now practised at this point by churches in the Tractarian tradition. As Dr Mascall himself says in an appendix to the same book:

> It would be widely held that there are three great moments in the Mass: (1) the Offertory, in which bread and wine are solemnly given to God by the Church; (2) the Consecration, in which they are transformed into the Body and Blood of Christ; and (3) the Communion, in which they are given back to the Church as her sacramental food. It is the view of the Offertory here expressed that I feel bound to question. I would not describe it as an *offering* of bread and wine, in the strict sense of an offering made to God. If we go back to the Last Supper and consider the four actions of our Lord—he took, he blessed, he broke, he gave—we see that the first of these, which corresponds to the Offertory of the liturgy, was not an act of offering, but of reception: he *took*. And in the primitive liturgies, such as that of Hippolytus, the Offertory is simply the bringing to the altar of the elements for the sacramental rite.[2]

Dr Mascall goes on to maintain that the real offertory prayer is the Anaphora, the prayer of consecration itself, beginning at the *Sursum Corda*:

> There is not first an offering and then a consecration, for not until the consecration are the gifts fit for offering. But neither, on the other hand, is there first a consecration and then an offering, for the consecration is simply the transformation by God's acceptance of the gifts that are offered to him. There is one prayer, the great Eucharistic Thanksgiving, which simultaneously consecrates and offers in one action.[3]

I think that many who do not find it easy to use Dr Mascall's kind of theological language are in this matter in fundamental agreement with him. If the gifts are first offered, and then afterwards consecrated, they must be material oblations; they represent ourselves, our works and the world of creatures. This interpretation is almost forced upon us if we interpret "oblations" in the Prayer for the Church of the consecrated elements, and offer them with the alms for God's acceptance. But can this be "a true and proper sacrifice"? If it is, all prayers and all alms, all praise and all thanks are sacrifices, and this is true in a certain sense. Then all eucharistic controversies disappear in an inflation of words. If on the other hand the eucharistic offering follows the consecration, those who believe in the real presence must hold that Christ's Body and Blood are offered in sacrifice. And this creates fresh difficulties for them and for others.

The great merit of Dr Mascall's exposition lies in his insistence on

[1] P. 56. [2] Pp. 182–3. [3] P. 154.

the identity of consecration and offering. If consecration is, as he says, "the transformation by God's acceptance of the gifts that are offered to him", what the Church offers is bread and wine, in remembrance of the death and passion, the resurrection and ascension of Christ. What God gives back to us is Christ's Body and Blood.

We differ in our interpretation of the meaning of "remembrance", and of the manner, time, and place of the real presence, and these differences cannot at present be resolved. They might be resolved through a greater unity in rite. I do not believe that even as things are at present, they present obstacles to common worship. The obstacles arise not so much from the order in the *Book of Common Prayer* as from our attempts to supply what is lacking in that order. The rubric before the Prayer for the Church refers explicitly to the preparation of the elements, which in medieval times might take place at the beginning of the eucharistic office, as at the Dominican rite in Low Mass, between the Epistle and the Gospel, as in the Dominican rite at High Mass, or in the offertory, as in the rubrics of the Roman Missal.[1] A like diversity prevailed in the Church of England between 1552 and 1662, and has survived in practice the insertion of a rubric intended to promote uniformity, but never observed universally. The development of a ceremonial offertory at this point arises from a tendency among High Church divines in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to interpret "oblations" in the Prayer for the Church of the eucharistic elements.[2] But Bishop Lanclot Andrewes, and probably other Anglican divines of the same period, used the like ceremonies after the Prayer of Humble Access, before beginning the Prayer of Consecration, and their practice is reflected in another rubric, also inserted in 1661:

> When the Priest, standing before the Table, hath so ordered the Bread and Wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency break the Bread before the people, and take the Cup into his hands, he shall say the Prayer of Consecration as followeth.

The evidence for an offertory at this point is contained in *Notes on the Book of Common Prayer* derived from marginalia in a prayer book used by Andrewes himself, who wrote:

> Here the priest, having made adoration, poureth water upon the napkin ready for that purpose, and cleanseth his hands:

He continued in Latin to provide for the recitation of verses from the psalm, *Lavabo in innocentia manus meas*, for the movement of breads from the canister to the paten, and for mixing the chalice:

> Postremo omnibus rite, et quam fieri potest, decentissime atque aptissime compositis, stans pergit et peragit.[3]

---

[1] See J. Wickham Legg, *Ecclesiological Essays*, 1905, pp. 106–78.

[2] See Simon Patrick, *Mensa Mystica*, 1684, and Charles Wheatly, *Rationale of the Book of Common Prayer*, 1st ed., 1710, pp. 319–21 of the standard edition of 1858. The intentions of the revisers in 1661 are discussed by Bishop John Dowden, *Further Studies in the Prayer Book*, 1908, pp. 176–223.

[3] *Works* in the *Anglo-Catholic Library*, Vol. XI, p. 157.

The language clearly affects the language of the rubric.

I believe that the practice of Bishop Andrewes was based on a mistaken notion that the preface is preliminary to the Prayer of Consecration, and not an integral part of the eucharistic thanksgiving. Given this belief, he was right in placing his Offertory before the consecration. It would be more consistent with our present understanding of the history and structure of the eucharist to make the Offertory after the Comfortable Words, but before "Lift up your hearts".

Dr Mascall seems to me to confuse the Offertory with the preparation of the elements, when he writes that

> In the primitive liturgies . . . the Offertory is simply the bringing to the altar of the elements for the sacramental rite.[1]

Is it not rather the taking of those elements from the deacons by the bishop and his presbyters before they begin the preface to the great eucharistic thanksgiving? The preparation of the elements may be done in several places, in a chapel of prothesis, on the credence, on the altar at the Offertory, as in the Roman rite, or before the prayers of the faithful, as in the Book of Common Prayer. But the proper place for the Offertory is before the preface.

Dr Mascall and I agree that the present practice is unsatisfactory. I think that a change could be made before any revision of the Prayer Book, simply by observing the meaning of the rubric before the Prayer for the Church, and shifting the rubric after the Prayer of Humble Access to before the preface, in accordance with the probable intention of the revisers in 1661. An act of oblation at this point would declare the truth that the eucharistic thanksgving is the prayer of oblation, whether or not the verb to offer, or any of its equivalents, occurs in the Prayer of Consecration. All consecration involves offering, in whatever sense "bread and wine, consecrated into the Sacramental Body and Blood of Christ" can be called "a material proper sacrifice" in the language of John Johnson of Cranbrook and other of our elder divines.[2]

This change would also enable us to restore meaning to our traditional division between the Ante-communion and the Communion, by treating the Prayer for the Church as what it really is in our own domestic tradition, the successor not only of the medieval prayers of the prone, but of the primitive prayers of the faithful, retained in the Roman rite only in the solemn collects on Good Friday, and in the solitary *oremus* before the Offertory.[3] What corresponds to the Offertory procession in the old Anglican tradition is the approach of the communicants to the altar, to be "conveniently placed for the receiving of the holy Sacrament" before the exhortation and the Communion devotions.

GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

[1] Op. cit., p. 183.

[2] See the prefatory epistle to *The Unbloody Sacrifice*, Vol. I, p. 5, in Johnson's Works in the *Anglo-Catholic Library*.

[3] See H. Jungman, *Missarum Solemnia*, Eng. trans., 1951, Vol. I, pp. 480–90.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Lady Oppenheimer is a graduate of Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford.
The Rev. M. R. Talbot is Vicar of Esh and Hamsteels, Durham.
Mr Reckitt is the author of *Militant Here in Earth*, etc.
Brother George Every is a member of the Society of the Sacred Mission at Kelham.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE PROPOSED LECTIONARY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

With all respect to the Dean of Winchester's comments in your April issue, I imagine that most parish priests are delighted to use a lectionary that offers no alternative lessons on Sundays. A "free" service, planned throughout by the officiant, may have great value. But the value of the office lies very largely in its very fixedness: for instance, an instructed congregation is encouraged to feel that it is offering the worship of the whole church.

Where no alternative lessons are offered, the parish priest, when preparing his sermons, has simply to decide either to submit his mind to a text chosen from the authorized pair of lessons, or to look elsewhere for inspiration. Moreover, it is useful for visiting preachers to know without inquiry what lessons will be read.

The lectionary authorized by Convocation in 1955 certainly fails to eradicate a serious defect in its predecessors, notably those compiled in this century, in that it requires the omission of passages from the orderly reading of the canonical books in favour of the special lessons chosen for holy days. By the irony of things, the omitted passages are often of crucial importance to the appreciation of what goes before and after. Sometimes, indeed, they provide oases.

Mr Robert Symonds has spoken of a plan (perhaps devised by him) whereby, when each holy day with its special lections was ended, the ordinary course of daily lessons should be resumed at the point where it had been interrupted. The rules required would in this case be complicated but no one would need to be worried by them save a single official entrusted with the task of compiling the current annual lectionary.

In this respect, the Dean's horror of the Pie seems out of date. The situation has radically altered since the prefaces to the Prayer Book were composed, for an annual calendar can now be printed cheaply and made easily accessible.

The ideal Anglican office book would contain the Bible itself. In

its cover could be a pocket to hold the current calendar and lectionary.

Yours faithfully,
F. Coventry.

St Mary Magdalene Vicarage,
Enfield.

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

May I be bold enough to suggest that the voluminous correspondence, in Theology and elsewhere, consistently refuses to face one fundamental point? Surely the Christian life of prayer is one integrated thing; Mass, Office and "private" prayer are but three parts of a unified whole. In the new lectionary there are cases where the second lessons overlap with the Gospel for the day. Although it may do us no harm to read the same passage twice in twenty-four hours, the implication seems to be that some of us attend the Eucharist and others say, or attend, Morning and Evening Prayer, but that no one has any use for both.

Bringing the question within bounds, it appears to be forgotten that the lessons are but a part, and a comparatively minor part, of the Office, and it is quite useless to try to construct a lectionary until we have decided exactly what the Anglican Office is, and what it is for. Is it a "Sunday service" for the edification of the masses, or is it a meditative private devotion for the clergy, or is it an objective act of praise to God the Father by the members of the Mystical Body of Christ?

Accepting the last interpretation, I feel bound to submit the following four points, radical as they are:

1. Give up all idea of consecutive reading.
2. Give up the view that there is some obscure virtue in plodding through the whole Bible in a specified period of time.
3. Make the lessons subservient to the Office itself, and of a length consistent with its structure—say a maximum of ten verses.
4. Recognize Matins as the proper prologue to the Eucharist, and make the lessons shorter still. There seems little point in four long readings from Holy Scripture within half an hour.

Bible reading and meditation are of course essential to the Christian life, but they are distinct from, though related to, the Office.

Doubtless this particular view will be challenged, but my main contention still stands: no one can be expected to produce a satisfactory lectionary until we are clear about the purpose of the Office itself.

Yours faithfully,
Martin Thornton, O.G.S.

[With reference to Mr Brian Taylor's letter in the June issue of THEOLOGY, Mr John Brown, of the Oxford University Press, points out that "a Daily Service Book, consisting of the B.C.P. and the complete Bible, including the Apocrypha" is already published by the O.U.P. It is issued in pocket size with the 1662 Prayer Book, and in four styles in large type (two with the 1662 and two with the 1928 Book). Mr Brown adds: "The suggestion that the B.C.P. should be placed in the centre of the book would be easy to carry out and we are arranging to adopt this method in future." On the other hand, he says that "the omission of unwanted parts of the Prayer Book would not be, from the printing point of view, the economy that it may appear, because the rearrangement of pages required, for example to retain the Collects without the Epistles and Gospels, would be expensive compared with the use of the complete Prayer Book, whereas the extra bulk is relatively small". The Rev. David Paton calls attention to the fact that Messrs. A. R. Mowbray purvey a copy of the 1928 Prayer Book bound up with the Bible in a case which also has room for their Kalendar (which includes the Lectionary) for the sum of £5 8s. 6d. "The type," he says, "is not too small for use on a railway train. In days when a gent's lounge suit costs from 3 to 5 times as much—and doesn't last as long—this is good value."—ED. THEOLOGY.]

ORDINAND'S FIANCÉES

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I should like cordially to endorse the remarks made by the Chaplain of Trinity in the final paragraph of his letter. As a bachelor ordinand, I cannot possibly accept Mr James's challenge to produce "a much-needed article on clerical marriage", but I would offer the following suggestions to anyone bold enough to undertake the task.

(i) Could not C.A.C.T.M., with the co-operation of the Mothers' Union, consider the possibility of starting a Fellowship of Ordinands' Fiancées, operating on a diocesan level, parallel with the Fellowships of Vocation which now exist in most dioceses? Of the setting up of joint committees there is, of course, no end, but surely we ought to give more consideration to the training of fiancées of ordinands and of the younger clergy. I would not decry what many theological colleges are already doing; but their task is to train men for the Ministry, and the training of fiancées ought to be in the hands of specialists.

(ii) Many of the best clergy wives are either the daughters of clergy, or have received missionary or parochial training. But such wives are pearls of great price, and they seem to be rarer nowadays than they were a generation ago. The fiancées of ordinands whom I have known seem to be drawn almost exclusively from the nursing and teaching professions, and, if this is a representative sample, we have a class of young ladies already well versed in dealing with people, but probably lacking the knowledge of pastoralia and parochial methods, not to mention the items listed by Mr James. And at this point C.A.C.T.M. and the Mothers' Union could do something of immense value.

Yours faithfully,

SYDENHAM. J. I. MILLER.

PAPER CHURCH

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

It is an epidemic, which the authorities are doing their best to foster. If it is true that there are three kinds of falsehood—lies, damned lies, and statistics—then we are being asked to be partakers in other men's sins to an unprecedented extent. If the Central Board of Finance intend to flood the country annually with forms similar to those issued this year, the treasurers of our P.P.C.s, especially in small country parishes, may well be excused if they resign their posts.

As a practical suggestion I would ask that the Board should design an account book for the use of treasurers which should be simple enough for the unlearned financier to use, and from which he could read off the answers to the official questions without having to do a lot of extra arithmetic. It might even be designed with duplicate pages for the annual statement, one of which could be sent to the Board every year, thereby saving them (and the Church) the cost of printing and posting forms.

Just one question: What is the annual circulation of the Year Book, and who read it?

Yours truly,
MAURICE FROST.

DEDDINGTON VICARAGE,
OXFORD.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE EPISTLES OF PAUL THE APOSTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS AND TO PHILEMON. By C. F. D. Moule. Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary. C.U.P. 21s.

One of the achievements of the present Archbishop of York's all too brief tenure of the Regius Chair of Divinity at Cambridge was the launching of a new series of commentaries on the Greek text of the New Testament designed gradually to replace the veterans of the Cambridge Bible and the Cambridge Greek Testament. Professor Moule, one of the first contributors enrolled, has now taken over the General Editorship, and it is appropriate that his own contribution should inaugurate the series. It has certainly set an exacting standard for its successors, combining as it does the Cambridge tradition of close and meticulous examination of the text (the notes provide, incidentally, a signal illustration of how well the work of Lightfoot has worn in close on a century) with that cautious and reverent yet open-minded approach to critical questions which Professor Moule's readers have come to expect from him. It should be certain of a warm welcome.

A short introduction carefully considers, but ends by rejecting, the theories of E. J. Goodspeed and John Knox on the origin of Philemon and G. S. Duncan's view of the captivity which produced

Colossians. The "Colossian error" is held to be definitely Judaistic in character and to contain no element which could not have developed in the time of Paul and been dealt with by him in the language of the epistle. In his notes on the text (the Greek being omitted for reasons of space) Professor Moule states the alternative views of each crux with such scrupulous fairness that it is often hard to discern what finally tips the scales in favour of the exegesis which he actually adopts. To sample a few of his conclusions: he rejects the suggestion that Col. 1. 15–18 is a hymn originally composed independently of the epistle, and approves C. F. Burney's theory of it as a rabbinic meditation on creation texts of the O.T. The "sufferings of Christ" in Col. 1. 24 are for him *both* the sufferings of the historic Christ as shared by Christians in their union with the Suffering Servant, *and* the quota of "Messianic woes" which the Church is to fulfil before the end. He stands by his own view, already published, that the meaning of *μυστήριον* is substantially the same in Colossians and Ephesians—though he avoids rather carefully any discussion on the Ephesian question. He holds to Lightfoot's view, as against most subsequent commentators, that *στοιχεῖα* in St Paul are elements of basic teaching and not elements of the universe. But does it not unduly restrict the Pauline conception of *σάρξ* to describe it or its effects so exclusively in terms of "sensuality"?

The introduction contains a valuable, if compressed, account of the religious thought of the two epistles, and the theological asides in the notes are almost uniformly excellent (there is a particularly fine and lapidary one on the meaning of "present" in Col. 1. 22), with the exception of a note on "mortification" which appears to rest on an imperfect understanding of the way in which the term is understood by those Christians with whom Professor Moule disagrees.

The Rev. J. N. Sanders has furnished a section on the textual criticism of the Epistles. Some detached notes have been thrown into an appendix; that on "The Knowledge of God", in particular, will repay close study. An index would have been useful.

This is a commentary to recommend to anyone who can study the Greek text, specialist and non-specialist alike; and it is a promise of good things to come. There is really only one complaint. No discerning student of theology will object to paying a guinea for the distillation of Professor Moule's wisdom. But not all have attained to years of discretion in these matters, especially among the class of readers for whom the series is principally intended; and there are only 170 pages, however closely packed (one shudders to think of the probable price of a gospel). It would seem that exacting standards of book production, however desirable in themselves, can perhaps be bought too dearly. But if in fact nothing can be done about printing costs, could not a paper-back edition be considered?

HUMPHREY GREEN.

KING'S COLLEGE,
LONDON.

History of Religions. By E. O. James. "Teach Yourself Books." English Universities Press. 7s. 6d.

To deal, however briefly, with the History of Religions in a small book of 230 pages is a task that might well daunt a scholar less well equipped than Professor E. O. James; but he has achieved a masterly summary, which can be recommended to anyone desiring a clear, concise, and scholarly introduction to the subject.

A large part of the book necessarily covers ground familiar to students of Comparative Religion. But the reader's interest is enlisted at once by Chapter I ("How Religion Began"), with its illustrations showing the artistic skill of prehistoric man in cave sketches and carvings, with their "'numinous' reaction to the inexplicable" (p. 29). The chapters which follow deal with the Religions of Egypt and Mesopotamia (II); the Religions of India, including recently-discovered evidence of "pre-Aryan" cults, before even the Rig-Veda (III); the Religions of China and Japan (IV); Zoroastrianism and Judaism (V); the Religions of Greece and Rome (VI); and Christianity and Islam (VII). Truly an encyclopedic survey!

Here and there we meet with statements which may be open to question. The suggestion that the doctrine of the Upanishads is "pantheistic" (p. 72), while true in the main, hardly holds good in the case of the *Katha Upanishad,* which teaches that the Supreme is not only immanent but also transcendent:

> The one Inner Soul of every being,
> Enwrapped in every form, *is yet outside* (V, 1).

On p. 77 we read that "the Gita is to Hindus what the Bible is to Christians". It would, we suggest, be more accurate to say that the *Vedas* as a whole are to Hindus what the Bible as a whole is to Christians; and that within the Hindu Scriptures the Gita holds a central place, roughly akin to that of the Gospels within the Bible.

But these are trivial points; and, in general, Professor James keeps his readers amazed at the range and accuracy of his knowledge.

His account of the development of Christianity gives us the feeling that his sympathies lie with the Catholic, rather than with the Protestant, tradition; particularly in the terminology that he applies to the Eucharist (p. 182), and in his reference to the Church of Scotland as "one of the numerous Protestant denominations", while the Church of England is "the historic Church in England" (pp. 186 f.).

It is even more clear that his sympathies lie with a *Liberal* Catholicism, rather than with Rome, or even the more rigid type of Anglo-Catholicism. Still less does he show any leanings towards the "Neo-Calvinism" or "Biblical Theology" that is so much in vogue to-day on the Continent of Europe. Two extracts from his closing pages will indicate the essential liberal spirit of his approach to religion:

> Whether or not Jesus was in fact the Christ of God, or Muhammad was in fact the Prophet of God *par excellence,* is a question of faith and theology and "interior experience", not of historical and scientific determination. Nevertheless, the demonstration of the alleged unique character of the biblical or Qur'anic revelations depends very largely on the data

supplied by the comparative study of the history and content of these religions. Islam, Christianity and Judaism all maintain that they are in possession of a special self-disclosure of the Deity through their respective divinely appointed channels; but the grounds on which these contentions are based demand validation by an impartial comparative examination of the relevant evidence (p. 230).

To know what the deep things of the spirit mean for oneself, whatever one's spiritual allegiance and tradition may be, makes it possible to understand what these realities and values mean for others—provided that a universal religious consciousness is recognized as the common possession of all human beings (p. 231).

Such words reflect on the one hand a truly scientific impartiality, and at the same time a broad sympathy with those spiritual aspirations which are human-wide in their range, and underlie the manifold forms in which religion has been manifested.

E. C. Dewick.

Great Shelford.

White Kennett, 1660-1728, Bishop of Peterborough. By G. V. Bennett. S.P.C.K. for the Church Historical Society. 42s.

This is the first biography of White Kennett to appear since 1730. This neglect has not been warranted, for in his day White Kennett was by no means an unimportant figure on the ecclesiastical scene. His birth coincided with the restoration of the monarchy and in his undergraduate days he was an enthusiastic supporter of Charles II and the High Church party. The Revolution of 1688 placed him in a difficulty, but in the end he swallowed his scruples and took the oath of allegiance to the new king. In spite of this he remained in favour with the Non-Jurors and was appointed Rector of Shottesbrooke by its Non-Juring squire Francis Cherry. Under the protection of its squire, Shottesbrooke became an important Non-Juring centre and in spite of his sympathy with their cause the Non-Jurors made Kennett's position as its conforming Rector intolerable. This brought about a change in his political outlook, and on his removal to London he transferred his allegiance to the Government party. Before long he found himself the spokesman of the ministry of William III in an exceedingly hostile Lower House of Convocation. The bishops of the Upper House were loyal supporters of the Crown, whose nominees they were, and Kennett became their mouthpiece in the Lower House. In speeches and pamphlets he put the point of view of the moderate men against the Tory "High Flyers", who represented the opinion of the majority of the parochial clergy. This made Kennett extremely unpopular, for he was regarded by his old friends as a traitor and a turncoat. An altar-piece was erected in the parish church of Whitechapel in which Kennett was clearly to be seen depicted as Judas sitting at the Last Supper in the Upper Room.

Dr Bennett's researches have shed a great deal of light on the bitter disputes which led to the suppression of Convocation for over one hundred years. This study makes it clear that behind the unseemly ecclesiastical strife and the long wrangles about procedure lay

fierce political differences. The cry so often raised that the Church was in danger was little more than a ruse of the political opponents of the Government designed to embarrass it. For Kennett and many of his friends who supported the Government were not Latitudinarians. They were old-fashioned High Churchmen who were opposed to the use of ecclesiastical means to achieve political ends.

Kennett gained little enough for all the effort he put into the Government's support. He was no courtier and, judged by the standard of the time, a poor place-hunter as well. As Archdeacon of Huntingdon, and Dean and later Bishop of Peterborough, he could feel he was poorly rewarded for all the abuse showered upon him as the spokesman of an unpopuar official policy.

Fortunately there is another side to the story. Kennett was a pioneer in the field of local historical study and a founder of English medieval research. Dr Bennett pays full attention to this side of Kennett's life and shows how his subject's sound historical knowledge helped his controversial labours. Even now we have not told the full story of Kennett's work. He was also an exemplary parish priest in a London slum parish; a pioneer of the charity school movement and an early supporter of the S.P.C.K. and S.P.G. Dr Bennett gives us a fascinating account of his work as Bishop of Peterborough. We see the bishop carefully visiting his diocese; deeply concerned about the administration of Confirmation and holding frequent ordinations. In many ways this is the most interesting part of the book, and it is refreshing to pass from the bitter story of public controversy to this charming account of quiet, regular pastoral work going on behind the scenes. It helps us to understand how the Church continues to live and work when men despair of her public action and pronouncements. Kennett's energies led him into both worlds. He is remembered for his part in the disputes of his time, but it is his pastoral diligence as priest and bishop and his concern for historical research that appeal to us to-day. Dr Bennett's research has uncovered both sides of the man. The author has worked carefully through the mass of private papers Kennett left behind as well as the large number of pamphlets published about the disputes he was involved in. Dr Bennett is to be congratulated on producing such a fascinating and readable book from such a mass of indigestible material.

J. H. Jacques.

North Witham.

Christianity and Economic Problems. By D. L. Munby. Macmillan. 25s.

With much common sense, Mr Munby writes what amounts to a defence of the mixed-economy welfare state, which we associate in our minds with the name of Butskell, and quite rightly he sees this to be in some way a response to Christian ideas of service and democracy. He makes many wise and interesting comments upon the shortcomings of our present society, and refers to its involved "prob-

lems". But nothing he says about economic affairs appears to differ materially from what a number of non-Christian leftish economists have been saying for some time. Moreover, some of Mr Munby's presuppositions, those concerning the nature of economics, seem to have induced him to ignore many economic questions which make a strong appeal to other writers whom he roundly condemns. For example, though he writes at length about exports and the international situation, never once does he point out that the favourable balance of trade which every country is being exhorted to attain cannot possibly be enjoyed by every single country at any given time. The objective now set before us is, of course, in flat defiance of natural law! Again, in his references to "income" he does not call attention to the fact that the business man, whose enterprising qualities he so rightly values, has long since decided that what the income tax inspector and economist call "income" is a matter of relatively small importance—business expenses and tax-free capital profits are increasingly the operative incentives for business men to-day. Here, of course, a host of moral questions cry out for that healthy ventilation which economic analysis can supply.

Furthermore, though huge sums, running into thousands of millions of pounds are now in process of being spent by Government and Industry on the preparatory work for the atomic age, Mr Munby does not ask himself how far this expenditure may be attributed to an intelligent anticipation of future consumer demand, and how far it has resulted from a helpless drift—the product of cupidity, curiosity and fear. Again, our technologists' announcements about what is sometimes called "the fully automatic machine" call loudly for new systems of costing and wage fixing, yet Mr Munby does not even venture to try to translate the traditional Christian ideals of a just price and a fair wage into terms which might help this age, let alone an atomic one, to find new working formulas.

These criticisms must not be taken to imply that Mr Munby, an economist and fellow-Christian, has been wasting his time as he pondered over the connexion between his theology and his specialist science. But they do raise, in one mind at least, a doubt whether there can ever be a rational connexion between a sound theology and the kind of science which Mr Munby declares economics to be.

For what can we make of "a science which is also an art", of laws "which only hold good for a period"; of terminology which refers to mysteries as problems and enables Mr Munby to warn us "not to suffer the delusion that all our problems are soluble".

We must still believe that if a problem is a problem it can be stated, and that once it has got itself clearly stated it becomes an answer and no longer a problem. We can still believe this and yet thank Mr Munby for a valiant effort to find a path through the slough in which many of us are still wandering. But the gap between the thinking of theologians and economists remains to be bridged. Most economists will regard Mr Munby's opening chapter as nothing but theological jargon; most theologians will remain as mystified as ever after reading what he has to say upon "The Nature of Econo-

mics". Perhaps the book we are waiting for is a "Religio Economi", a plain account of the way a doctor of economics has found a way to God in and through his specialist studies. Is it presumptuous to invite Mr Munby to essay this task?

T. M. Heron.

SHORTER NOTICES

Atlas of the Bible. By L. H. Grollenberg, O.P. Translated and edited by Joyce M. H. Reid and H. H. Rowley, with a foreword by W. F. Albright and H. H. Rowley, and a preface by Roland de Vaux, O.P. Nelson. 70s.

It is love at first sight with this very splendid book, and longer acquaintance only deepens the affection. It is very much more than an atlas. Its maps, it is true, are of a very high quality; but in addition there are hundreds of magnificent photographs, supplemented by some drawings. There is also a continuous narrative, telling the story of Israel up to and including "The Fullness of Time", with plentiful documentation unobtrusively provided in the margin. In fact, here is a first-rate short illustrated history to accompany the study of the Bible. Father Grollenberg writes with the authority and enthusiasm of a field archaeologist, with the loving reverence of a devout Roman Catholic, and with the humour and simplicity of one who is human; and the translating and editorial work are conspicuously successful.

But although the reading is excellent and the pictures very striking, a special value of the book for students, it will be agreed, is its complete index of all biblical place-names (together with certain personal names when they are relevant), with references, whenever identification is possible or probable, to the appropriate map. Each map, in its turn, is made as informative as possible by such aids as short summaries of events printed suitably near to the places to which they relate, arrows indicating the movements of peoples and armies, and appropriate variations in colour and style. Here and there the reader is given a useful peep behind the scenes of archaeological technique. Everywhere the information is served up gracefully and with vivacity. The book is a joy to use—popular in a good sense.

I cannot claim to have tested the index throughout, but the standard of accuracy in the letterpress as a whole inspires confidence. In a large and complicated piece of translating and printing, I only noticed two apparent slips (p. 31, the forty days' fast is described as *preceding* Christ's baptism, and p. 114a *sub fin.*, a "not" seems to be needed), and four tiny misprints (p. 71b, read *'ûlam* for *'ûlam*; p. 80b *sub fin.*, reverse quotation-mark; p. 97a, ? read "racy" for "ricy"; p. 106 *sub fin.*, read "upon" for "up on").

Perhaps the book is too expensive for many students to possess for themselves. But that is not to say that its cost is higher than such

superb production warrants. At least it should be in all biblical libraries; and the discerning individual will forgo his next fifty cinemas in favour of these pictures.

C. F. D. Moule.

Cambridge.

The Renewal of the Church. By W. A. Visser 't Hooft. S.C.M. Press. 12s. 6d.

Those (and they are many) who suppose that "an itinerant ecumenical secretary", as Dr Visser 't Hooft describes himself, leads a life divorced from learning or reflection, will do well to read these Dale Lectures delivered at Mansfield College, Oxford, in 1955. It will be hard for them to withhold admiration from the power and charity with which Dr Visser 't Hooft expresses the conviction underlying his life's work, or from the ease with which he marshals a language that is not, after all, his native tongue.

The main thesis may perhaps be summed up in two sentences which the author quotes with approval:

"The uniting churches acknowledge that the Church must always be ready to correct and reform itself in accordance with the teaching of the Holy Scriptures as the Holy Spirit shall reveal it."—Constitutional documents of the C.S.I.

"All the errors of Rome come from the direct identification of the Church as an organized institution, taking its part in the process of history, with the Kingdom of God."—W. Temple. (But it is fair to add that Dr Visser 't Hooft is careful to do justice, with useful quotations from Fr Congar, to signs of renewal within Rome, and throughout his lectures to stress that *none* have won ecumenical prizes.)

A member of another Reformed body heartily applauds the way in which this thesis is argued, and is particularly glad to have the inadequacy of the Vincentian canon pointed out on p. 65. But a member of a Catholic body looks for something largely omitted—the *ethical* content of this perpetual renewal which Dr Visser 't Hooft desiderates. The fruit of the Spirit is, after all, love, joy, peace, and the rest; and by our fruits they will know us. Is a Reformed Christian, even an ecumenical one, still so afraid of "works" that he has no room to discuss the daily discipline and witness of a Church renewed? And is not such a renewal, however eschatological its insight, apt to remain in the realm of ideas without, for example, some proper penitential system for ordinary folk with ordinary sins? The criticism may seem ungrateful to so excellent a book, and one necessarily limited in scope. This, perhaps, ought Dr Visser 't Hooft to have done; but not, assuredly, to have left undone the other thing he *has* done with so shrewd a vision.

Patrick C. Rodger.

Annandale,
Golders Green.

THE SACRAMENT OF THE ALTAR. By Miles Sargent. Mowbray. 5s.

THE DOUBLE CURE: HOW TO RECEIVE FORGIVENESS. By Eric James. Hodder and Stoughton. 2s. 6d.

A POCKET BOOK FOR CHRISTIANS. By a Religious of C.S.M.V. S.C.M. Press. 1s.

The first, a very readable book, expounds in fifteen short chapters the Prayer Book doctrine of the Eucharist. The first five chapters form a general introduction, and the remaining chapters are based on the Actions of the Liturgy in the proper order. This is a great convenience for reference, and, more important, helps to preserve in the reader's mind the significance and drama of the whole. Sung Eucharist is the form of the Liturgy on which the book is based, and references to 1549, 1662, and 1928 are frequent and illuminating.

I wish that in Chapter 4, "The Sacrifice of the Altar", the idea of our Lord "offering and pleading the eternal sacrifice" could be expanded in future editions; for its naïve and literal meaning is often a stumbling-block to the inexperienced Christian. Apart from this, the teaching is lucid and persuasive, without any of the unctuous exhortation that often mars books on this subject; and there is no suggestion of "taking sides". There are good passages on some less "popular" aspects (e.g. Confession and Incense) and a number of memorable sentences (e.g. "Being a communicant is a state of life, not a series of detached actions").

It is claimed in Canon Hood's introduction that the book will be useful to those responsible for teaching religion in the higher forms of schools. This should certainly be true, and to pupils as well as teachers. It might well be also read by laymen, especially parents, who are genuinely anxious to widen their outlook and deepen their spiritual understanding. It should decidely *not* be read by those who do not wish their conviction of the error of "high-church" practice to be disturbed.

What Canon Sargent has referred to in a brief page, the Rev. Eric James, Chaplain of Trinity College, Cambridge, has expanded in a short book. "I was brought up with a violent prejudice against sacramental confession," writes the Bishop of Coventry in his Introduction. "It was Roman . . . It was unsafe . . . It was unnecessary. . . ." A great many people feel like that. This book ought at least to dispel prejudice, for the author writes in so simple and friendly a style that it is difficult to push him away; he will not let you slam the door; and he offers you something worth having. Doubts and difficulties are dealt with convincingly, though the difficulty of personal relationship ("Can one confess to a priest whom one knows?") is hardly mentioned. Particularly good is the emphasis on the specifically Anglican form and intention of Confession. But a great, if not the greatest, merit of this book is its challenge: some readers will realize that for many of us the antipathy we feel towards Confession arises from our own prejudice and pride; others, perhaps, will henceforth be better able to bear witness to the cleansing power of the "Double Cure".

The best part of *A Pocket Book for Christians* is the Introduction, which is sensible and suggestive. The book is really a pocket book of prayer, designed for brief moments of leisure, travelling on the bus, or a respite from the kitchen. It speaks of Supplication, Intercession, Dart Prayers, etc., in a human and practical way. It seems, however, a little limited and "special". The examples will be of great value to the converted and the experienced. But it is doubtful whether they will "speak to the condition" of those who are manfully seeking and struggling.

H. C. A. Gaunt.

Winchester College.

Jesus and the First Three Gospels. By W. E. Bundy. Harvard University Press (London: Geoffrey Cumberlege). 60s.

This is not a commentary for the beginner nor for the pastor, but for the more advanced student wanting a radical treatment of each section of Synoptic material with its parallels where they exist. The treatment is based on that of many critics who flourished especially in Germany at the turn of the century or who belonged, like Bultmann, to the more extreme wing of the Form-critical school after the First World War. The more restrained and accurate scholarship of modern English scholars like A. H. McNeile, A. E. J. Rawlinson or even J. M. Creed is hardly drawn upon, and the work of C. H. Dodd, Hoskyns and Davey, T. W. Manson and many others is neglected in favour of the ideas of Wellhausen, Loisy, Volkmar, Spitta, all of whom "have done their best and worst and parted". It may be useful, however, to know what they did in their day and to what lengths of scepticism some of them could go. But the book, on which enormous trouble must have been taken, is disappointing.

C. S. C. Williams.

Merton College,
Oxford.

Racine: Confessions. Unpublished Sonnets. Translated by Walter Roberts. Mowbray. 13s. 6d.

After two and a half centuries these 128 sonnets can be confidently attributed to the author of "Phèdre" rather than to an unwholesome and unlikely contemporary. They belong to the waning of the century, of the "Roi Soleil", and of the poet's life. They were written in exile from the Court: which meant far more than mere political eclipse and social obscurity. It meant being cut off from all intellectual and worthwhile activities. "How can a God so tender and so good/Yet plunge his creature in black solitude?" The references are

often fascinatingly ambivalent. The political and the religious levels merge. As in the Psalms, one may be very uncertain of what associations a work like "enemies" is to take. The terms for Louis and for the Almighty are interchangeable.

As we are in no danger of being allowed to forget, Racine was a man of intense feeling and deep religious experience. Also, something of a Jansenist: "A paralytic at the grotto's edge,/In vain I seek to plunge into the pool." But, quite frankly, there is no comparison between the impact of these effusions and, say, the "terrible" sonnets of Gerard Manley Hopkins. Racine must be among the least translateable of poets. All is in the nuance and the overtone. Although Mr Roberts has carried out his task heroically, these inevitably disappear. His "free paraphrase", probably the best course possible, takes us further from the poetry. The exigencies of the sonnet form compel in any case some ugly inversions and near-bathos. One feels that those sufficiently concerned to peruse will be concerned enough to go further—to the French. Meanwhile, of Mr Roberts' efforts let it be said: *C'est magnifique mais ce n'est pas le cœur.*

D. W. Foster.

Hull.

The English Town in the Last Hundred Years. By John Betjeman. Cambridge University Press. 3s. 6d.

It might be supposed that Mr Betjeman's lecture could be of little concern to readers of Theology save in their capacity of persons of taste. Many of them are, however, custodians of buildings and not only of the "grand old parish churches" which are proving such a millstone round the neck of the contemporary Church of England. Truth to tell, many of these are more grand than old, so iconoclastically did the nineteenth century seek to restore them to what it was imagined that they once had been. To see the English town through Mr Betjeman's eyes will preserve his readers from the relics of ecclesiology, the rigours of sheer antiquarianism, and the wearisome spruceness of town and country planning. Aesthetic obloquy is of all obloquys the easiest, so various and grotesque are the objects to which, for instance, the town council's new lamp-posts may be compared. It is a form of scorn in which the Horace Walpoles of to-day are not backward. But *The English Town in the Last Hundred Years* will widen our appreciation far more than it will teach us to be outraged. The noble skyline produced by Wyattville at Windsor Castle will not be despised because it is Wyattville, and the clergyman will come to treasure some of the comparatively recent additions to the parish church and, it may be, the building itself, although it is not one of the "grand old" ones.

Frank Bennett.

Maidstone.

WALKING WITH CHRIST: A LITTLE BOOK OF FAMILY PRAYERS. By the Bishop of Rochester. S.P.C.K. 1s. 6d.

In framing this little book the Bishop of Rochester had in mind the purpose of stimulating family worship among church people. There are forms of prayer for morning and evening. The prayers for each day of the week emphasize some particular aspect of our Lord's life and work, and there are prayers suitable for various family occasions. A most insightful and practical manual which should prove of great value in many homes.

THE SCIENCE OF PRAYER. By Michael Bruce. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

This is a newly revised edition of a book first published in 1937. In the words of the author: "The first part of the book is an attempt to work out the theory of the science of prayer logically from point to point; the last section is concerned with the technique of the science of prayer." Many aspects of the prayer-life are covered: Meditation, Confession, Petition, Guidance, Intercession, Thanksgiving, Adoration. From his own experience the author shows the learner the steps by which progress can be made in the life of prayer, though he is aware that all his readers will not follow him all the way—for example, in the matter of prayers for the dead and requests for the prayers of the Saints. In a full appendix he gives examples of methods of prayer. Theologically, this work represents a sacramentally orientated belief. It is spiritual in tone, reflecting the intensely personal faith of its author. He quotes from memory, which leads to a few minor inaccuracies, e.g. that St Paul said, "All our righteousnesses are as filthy rags".

STRENGTHENING THE SPIRITUAL LIFE. By Nels F. S. Ferré. Collins. 6s.

This is a different type of book. Its author is Professor of Philosophical Theology in the Vanderbilt University School of Religion. It is written with some amount of psychological insight. Its formula for spiritual success is: Worship, work, wait. Says the author: "I should like to prescribe this 'divine formula' for all who need relief from worry, rest from work, and peace of heart for genuine well-being." This book, too, grows out of experience. The author has learned the art of sustained prayer through years of pain and suffering. There is no reference here to sacraments; the emphasis is on personal devotions and family devotions. The author's outlook is broad. His suggestions for reading include great minds of all schools both past and present. Here is a guide to prayer from one who has learned to relax, to reflect, to commune in his own heart and to be still, and from that stillness to look out over the world with the compassion of Christ.

OWEN R. BRANDON.

LONDON COLLEGE OF DIVINITY.

BRIDEGROOM AND BRIDE. By Ronald Knox. Sheed and Ward. 8s. 6d.

If I were in love and a Roman Catholic I should hope that somehow I could prevail upon Mgr Ronald Knox to give the address at my wedding. Many besides those who have been successful in doing so would be delighted to read these admirable sermons collected together for the first time. They have all the characteristics that we expect from their author—scholarship, a careful economy of words, great spiritual truths put in simple language, humour, and a personal touch that is exactly fitted to the occasion.

Those Anglican clergymen, who loyally obey the clear instruction of our Prayer Book marriage service to preach a sermon (as opposed to a private muttering to the couple orchestrated with organ "background") will be stimulated by these sermons. But I must warn anyone who is tempted to plagiarism that just as the Earl Marshal told Mgr Knox the required length of such preachments, so it will be quickly realized that sermons like these have been delivered at weddings where the main drink at the reception was Bollinger '45 rather than a pint of mild and brown.

GEORGE REINDORP.

LONDON.

THE STATUS OF ANIMALS IN THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. By C. W. Hume. Universities Federation for Animal Welfare. 8s. 6d.

The author, who is secretary-general of the Federation which publishes his book, first examines the relationship between animals and humans in the Bible. This he defines as neighbourliness. But he considers that the Greek philosophy which came to dominate Christian thought contained intellectual pride which was inimical to Christianity, to science and to animals. It also included spiritual pride and social pride. The Dominicans and Thomists did much to fix this unneighbourly attitude towards the beasts on the Church. Major Hume clearly has no feelings of neighbourliness towards Greek philosophy. The Renaissance worsened the animals' lot, for it entailed a revival of pagan superstitions and cruelty. The Franciscans were pioneers of a new attitude towards created things and were consequently the fathers of the new natural science. This and the evangelical revival have done much to restore the lot and prestige of the animals. The author then discusses what should be the proper status of animals with reference to their sensation, pain, instincts, learning, reasoning, language, attention, emotions, personality and the possibility of their future life. He examines the present Roman Catholic position and finds it specially favourable in England and France. He finds that some other religious bodies have made favourable pronouncements but that the provinces of Canterbury and York lag behind. He considers the prevailing notions of sin both past and present to be sex-ridden and in a final chapter, in which he dwells upon the redemp-

tion of all creation, he considers that neighbourliness to animals may well serve as a *praeparatio evangelica*, especially in the mission field. There follow seven excursi or additional notes.

All this the author accomplishes in 100 pages, albeit fairly large pages. Although he has read much in a variety of directions, the treatment in covering so much ground is necessarily slight. This impression is increased because the wit and humour with which the book is spiced often lead the author into some more or less irrelevant digressions. The book is well documented and indexed and should cause many to think reasonably (though not along the lines of Greek rationalism!) about what our attitude to the other animals should be.

Every page contains a little thumb-nail sketch of some creature in the Bible by Fougasse. We learn that the artist has co-operated with the author for the last thirty years. The reference is given in each case and it is fun seeing if one can recall the text.

FRANK BISHOP.

ST GILES' VICARAGE,
CAMBERWELL.

CODEX CLIMACI RESCRIPTUS GRAECUS (MS. GREGORY 1561, L). Edited by Ian Moir. "Texts and Studies", n.s. ii, 1956. Cambridge University Press. 30s.

While Mrs A. S. Lewis deciphered much of the Climacus palimpsest, the use of the ultra-violet fluorescence cabinet has enabled further progress to be made. (The notes on the use of this method are set out on pp. 109 f.) This palimpsest MS. has two treatises of St John Climacus in Syriac on top of some Greek and of some other Syriac writing. The Greek includes some passages of the Septuagint and Mr Moir has recently published an important article on two of these LXX fragments (*J.T.S.*, n.s. viii, 1957, 1–11). The New Testament Greek sections cover 34 leaves, of which 30 can be deciphered. The text of these sections is of parts of all four Gospels, though Luke is poorly represented. The Marcan and Lucan passages are confined to excerpts from the Passion narrative, written on six leaves with the various parallel sections in sequence. The omissions from Matthew and John are curious and "defy even grammar and logical sequence". The work may have been intended to be a primitive synopsis perhaps. Mr Moir has given us a valuable introduction with notes on the palaeography and contents as well as the history of the MS., which may be dated A.D. 650–700. The text is transcribed and collated with the Textus Receptus, that of Mark showing affinity with some members of the "Caesarean" clan. Here is a stimulating piece of sound scholarship.

C. S. C. WILLIAMS.

MERTON COLLEGE,
OXFORD.

The General Epistle of James. By R. V. G. Tasker. Tyndale Press. 7s. 6d.

This commentary, the first (apparently) to be issued in the "Tyndale New Testament Commentaries", a series sponsored by the Inter-Varsity Fellowship, is by the editor of the series himself.

The intention of the series, as defined in the General Preface, is "to place in the hands of students and serious readers of the New Testament, at a moderate cost, commentaries by a number of scholars who, while they are free to make their own individual contributions, are united in a common desire to promote a truly biblical theology". It is further promised that the commentaries (which are based upon the Authorized Version, though later versions are often preferred on textual and linguistic grounds) will be "primarily exegetical and only secondary homiletic".

These purposes are admirably executed in the first three chapters. After a critical introduction which puts up a reasoned defence of the traditional authorship, the comment is concise, the exegesis careful and illuminating. Particularly notable is the ingenious harmonization of the Pauline and Jacobean doctrines of justification (pp. 63 ff.). In the last two chapters, however, something has happened which changes the whole character of the commentary. The comment is inflated to enormous proportions by what—despite the professed intention of the introduction—can only be regarded as turgid homiletic: moral edification addressed to contemporary believers (e.g. the additional notes on 4. 5 and 4. 17) and a display of biblical erudition which, though no doubt in place at an I.V.F. Bible class, is barely relevant to an exegesis of the text (e.g. pp. 138–41). As a result, the average length of comment rises from two to four verses a page on chapters 1–3 to one verse to one and a half to two pages on chapters 4–5. By this time the student who reads the commentary for academic rather than devotional purposes will find himself requiring that patience of Job which evokes nearly two pages of discussion at 5. 11!

Reginald H. Fuller.

Seabury Western Theological Seminary,
Evanston, Illinois.

Catholic Biblical Encyclopaedia. By J. E. Steinmueller and Kathryn Sullivan. New York. Joseph F. Wagner. £6.

We are assured on many sides that a revival of biblical theology is taking place in the Roman Catholic Church, and the works of such eminent scholars as von Balthasar, Spicq and Daniélou certainly bear out this impression. But this biblical encyclopaedia will do very little to encourage such a revival. A sampling of a number of articles both on Old and New Testament subjects suggests that this work is at once intensely conservative and intensely rigid. The

authors' Preface claims that about the end of World War I "the evolutionary interpretation of the Bible (i.e. the Wellhausen School of 'higher criticism' . . .) was abandoned by the Protestant scholar, G. Kittel, and many others in favour of a more theological approach", and they add that such a new approach was necessitated by archeological discoveries. They evidently assume that this remarkably clear-cut event justified them not only in ignoring all "higher criticism", but in ignoring all criticism whatever. The article on Adam, for instance (O.T., p. 24), and the article on the Fall (O.T., pp. 354–6) give no hint that the story of Adam and Eve in the garden is not sober history; on the contrary, they describe exactly what happened to the supernatural gifts and natural faculties of the pair. The article on Jonas insists that the "stupendous miracle" of the prophet being swallowed by a sea-monster must have taken place, but does not mention the more stupendous miracle of Nineveh being ninety miles in diameter (O.T., p. 579). We are told that "critics no longer reject the story of Samson as a solar myth" (O.T., p. 952), because St Paul in Hebrews 11. 32 mentions Samson (though it must be admitted that the article on Hebrews (N.T., p. 303) is much more reasonable on the authorship of Hebrews).

The New Testament section includes a gallant attempt at a Gospel Harmony which might have some value for antiquarians (pp. 269–79), and a long article on Grace which begins with the words "To the human race, which inherited Adam's sin and added its own guilt by the personal sins of the individual members, Jesus Christ by His redemption or death on the Cross restored its original destiny and changed the hitherto existing relation of divine displeasure into one of friendship and grace"; to this last wholly unscriptural statement is then added a long disquisition reading into the New Testament the whole complicated structure of the Tridentine doctrine of grace, with all its niceties.

Though this vast book in all its 1860 pages must contain a great deal of accurate and perhaps useful information, its interpretation of the Bible is such that to a Roman Catholic brother anxious to engage in the revival of biblical theology we would have to say, *Non tali auxilio.*

R. P. C. Hanson.

University of Nottingham.

The Clothes of God. By Alice E. Buck and F. Claude Palmer. Peter Owen. 30s.

Christianity, Communism and History. By William Horden. Lutterworth Press. 12s. 6d.

The Communication of the Gospel to Illiterates. By H. R. Weber. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

By far the most interesting book for the pastor and theologian is the last because it deals with a subject that has long cried out for

attention. H. R. Weber, a former missionary of the Dutch Reformed Church, was invited in 1952 to go out to a remote island in Indonesia and help the local church with the problem of instructing converts in the rudiments of the Christian faith. For some thirty-five years now there have been 30,000 nominal Christians on the island of Luwuk-Banggai who were made members of the Church as a result of mass conversions. For various reasons they offered themselves by the hundred, but they received little baptismal instruction and later only limited pastoral oversight. Weber was faced with the problem of finding a simple and rapid means of teaching to these semi-literate and illiterate people some of the truths of the Bible. His use of group methods, of plays, dialogues, symbols, and retreats for the more awakened, are fascinating enough and call for careful examination. What is more important is the issue that he raises which relates to the communication of the Gospel to those who cannot read and whose intelligence one is allowed to assume is not of the highest order. Such a problem has always been of crucial concern to orthodox Protestantism, which has placed much greater emphasis on the Bible and preaching than on liturgical worship. It has relied on the written and spoken word rather than on the use of visual symbols and activities in which simple people can take a full part. Just because the author has seen the weakness of such a standpoint, and has offered some positive contribution, his book deserves to be widely read.

William Horden in *Christianity, Communism and History* sets out to substantiate an unusual thesis. He maintains that Communism is as much a religion as Christianity itself and that Marx has become a messianic figure esteemed as almost divine. These ideas are not at all new. What is more original is the contention that closer parallels can be seen to exist between Communism and sectarianism than between Communism and the main Christian denominations. This would appear to be particularly the case with regard to eschatology taught by the sects, and their basic attitude towards social institutions as being in some way tainted with evil. In practical affairs sectarians have been revolutionary in demanding justice and freedom for those who were oppressed, and here as in other matters they have stood in opposition to the Church. There is no difficulty in seeing a great deal of truth in this if one concentrates on certain types of sects, especially the communist-apocalyptic kind, but the author, an American, draws his material only from English and German sects of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The position becomes much more complex if a modern sect like Christian Science is considered. The truth is that it is almost impossible to formulate generalizations about the doctrine of sectarianism. None the less, some very worthwhile points are made by the writer, notably about sin and forgiveness when applied to the Christian and the Communist.

Those who are at home in extra-sensory perception, para-psychology and eclecticism will find plenty to get their teeth into in the "Treatise on Neo-analytic Psychology" by Alice Buck and Claude

Palmer. The firing-point of the book is a commendable one, for the authors begin by trying to find a reason why most people at the present time are only mildly worried by the possibility of being exterminated by the hydrogen bomb. Whether psychodynamics, dream interpretation and a mixture of Jungian philosophy provide the answer and offer hope for the future some may wish to question even when they have read *The Clothes of God.*

W. PICKERING.

EFFINGHAM.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ANGELO BELARDETTI (ROME): Giuliano Gennaro, O.F.M., *Lo Spirito di Crito* (n.p.).

A. AND C. BLACK: C. K. Barrett, *The Epistle to the Romans* (25s.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: James Strachan, *Early Bible Illustrations* (18s. 6d.); E. F. Osborn, *The Philosophy of Clement of Alexandria* (30s.); Colin Alves, *The Covenant* (7s. 6d.); C. R. Cragg, *Puritanism in the Period of the Great Persecution* 1660–1688 (30s.).

CAREY KINGSGATE PRESS: Hugh Martin, *The Seven Letters* (7s. 6d.).

GEOFFREY CHAPMAN: Leo Trese, *Many are One* (10s. 6d.).

ANDRÉ DEUTSCH: Alfred Métraux, *Easter Island* (21s.).

ECUMENICAL INSTITUTE OF THE COMENIUS FACULTY OF PROTESTANT THEOLOGY, PRAGUE: Amedeo Molnár (Ed.), *J. A. Comenius: A Perfect Reformation* (n.p.).

ÉDITIONS DU SEUIL: Louis J. Lekai, *Les Moines Blancs* (n.p.).

GOLLANCZ: Dawson Jackson, *A Primer of Necessary Belief* (14s.).

GUILD OF ST RAPHAEL: Henry Cooper, *Unction: a practical guide to its administration* (6d.).

HUNGARIAN REFORMED FEDERATION OF AMERICA: Imre Revesz, *History of the Hungarian Reformed Church* (n.p.).

LIVERPOOL UNIVERSITY PRESS: C. N. L. Brooke, *The Dullness of the Past* (3s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: Maurice Bevenot, S.J., *St Cyprian: The Lapsed. The Unity of the Catholic Church* (21s.).

MOWBRAY: The Prioress of Whitby: *Archbishop Garbett: A Memoir* (10s. 6d.); G. W. O. Addleshaw, *The Early Parochial System and the Divine Office* (3s. 6d.); The Author of "The Way", *A Guide for Spiritual Directors* (9s. 6d.).

NATIONAL SOCIETY AND S.P.C.K.: O. Jessie Lace, *Why do we Teach Christianity?* (2s. 6d.).

PETER OWEN: Muriel Spark and Derek Stanford (Eds), *Letters of John Henry Newman* (25s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: André Parrot, *Golgotha and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre* (10s. 6d.); Walter Freytag, *The Gospel and the Religions* (3s.); William Barclay, *Letters to the Seven Churches* (8s. 6d.); George S. Hendry, *The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology* (12s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: J. S. Purvis, *The York Cycle of Mystery Plays* [the complete cycle: the selection, published in 1951, was reviewed in THEOLOGY, October 1951, pp. 392 ff.] (25s.).

TYNDALE PRESS: André Schlemmer, *Faith and Medicine* (2s. 6d.).

U.M.C.A.: Gerald W. Broomfield, *Towards Freedom* (6s.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON

BEAUFOYS

SANCTUARY

COMMUNION WINE

Beaufoys *Sanctuary* Wine is of the highest standard, produced and bottled in Great Britain with the fermented juice of the finest quality grapes. As sole suppliers to the S.P.C.K. Beaufoys are proud to offer you this wine which has been prepared especially for Church purposes.

7/6d Per Bottle

(Postage: 2/- on 1 Bottle, 2/3d on 2 Bottles, 2/6d on 3 Bottles)

Packing and Carriage Free on all orders exceeding three bottles

Quantities of one dozen or over may be obtained through the S.P.C.K. delivered free and subject to special quantity reductions of 1/- per dozen; 1/6d per dozen on 2 dozen; and 2/- per dozen on 3 dozen or more.

THE ENGLISH OFFICE

(*Revised Edition*)

Persian Morocco. India Paper. Gilt-edged. Six markers.
Printed red and black.
Includes Office hymns, antiphons on all psalms etc.
Supplement contains Litanies.

Price with Lessons (1922) £5 5s.
Price without Lessons £3 3s.

An ideal gift for your Parish Priest or an ordinand.

SOCIETY OF SS PETER & PAUL
c/o C.L.A., 6 Hyde Park Gate, S.W.7

G. W. IRESON

HOW SHALL THEY HEAR?

9s. 6d. net

The first volume in the new S.P.C.K. series *The Priest's Library* is a thoroughly practical book on the art of preaching by a well-known preacher—Canon Gordon Ireson.

S·P·C·K